

AN
OPEN LETTER
TO
DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF,
ON
TOLERATION
AND
JOHN'S BAPTISM,
BY
CYRUS W. HARVEY.



Friends

BX

7748

B2

H2

AN
OPEN LETTER
TO
DAVID B. UPDEGRAFF,
ON
TOLERATION
AND
JOHN'S BAPTISM,
BY
CYRUS W. HARVEY.

✓ 1843-1916

QUAKERVILLE, KAN.
WESTERN FRIEND PRINT.
1887.

Friends

Bx
7748

B2
H2

EARLHAM COLLEGE

SEP 20 1990

LIBRARY

TOLERATION
AND
JOHN'S BAPTISM.

AN OPEN LETTER.

David B. Updegraff:

Dear Friend,

Thy favor of the 27th ult., with thy Richmond "Interview" enclosed is at hand; thy, "Address before Ohio Yearly Meeting" is also received. Thanks for these evidences of kindly interest. Several years ago, I thought I saw, that the trend of your movement would inevitably lead into the outward Ordinances, and I so stated in the WESTERN FRIEND in 1879; so I am not surprised at the turn things have taken.

To teach Holy Ghost baptism, as *only* a second or subsequent experience, and deny water baptism—having people saved, or justified, with neither water or Spirit baptism; seemed to my

mind from the first, so unbalanced, and out of the right order, that I thought it would be necessary to *evolve* some sort of a theory about water baptism, as a scaffold to support it. And when I see that thou applies such texts, as Paul's, "One baptism," and Peter's, "Like figure," to water baptism; and then recall the fact that according to Paul we are, "saved by the washing of regeneration;" "buried" and "risen with Christ" by baptism; or as Peter says, in the text thou quotes, "saved" by baptism: I see at once that the *evolution* of your *scaffold* is not yet complete. On this line which thou hast chosen, it is not possible, logically to halt, and hang mid way between the premises and conclusion; but the evolution must go on until the doctrine of, "baptismal regeneration," or that no one can be scripturally "saved," or "risen with Christ" without it is *evolved*; for no less than this is implied in these words of the apostles, if they apply to water baptism at all.

Although I stand in total disagreement with thy views on toleration and the ordinances; the inconsistency of many of thy opponents, officially and otherwise, in raising such a, "hue and cry," about the ordinances; when they teach views of Holy Ghost baptism, that make water baptism a necessity; and practice or allow so many things

destructive of the distinctive tenets of Quakerism; puts me in a sort of personal sympathy with thee. But while this movement against the Ordinances may not be inspired by a conviction of the necessity of maintaining many other principles held by Friends; nevertheless, when I view the present condition of our Society, in regard to its doctrines—even as thou stated in the “Interview”—if we are to maintain our distinctive denominational position as a church, it looks as if a policy condemning unsoundness, not only the outward ordinances, but many other things, *ought* to be speedily established in the Society of Friends.



CHAPTER 1.

TOLERATION.

I have been greatly interested in thy plea for, "toleration," or "liberty of conscience." But when a pretense of conscience, is made an excuse for opposing the distinctive views of a church in order to still retain a membership, it appears to me that it is a misnomer to call it Toleration. Such a position practically says, "no doctrine is unsound." And if no doctrines make unsound, how will a church maintain sound doctrine? How could the apostle write to any, to "earnestly contend for the faith," if all beliefs are equally good?

With the teaching and practice of your movement before me, it strikes my mind, that the liberalism, which thou with others has fostered, was tolerant of all sorts of *Anti-Quaker* opinions, because, at heart, you had no faith in the principles of real Quakerism. Your cohesiveness has, largely, been a *unity in opposition* to the principles of Friends. And when you got so far

away from Friends' principles that *this* element of cohesion was removed; the *intolerance* that had all along been manifested toward Conservative Friends, was easily turned against thyself and friends, the moment you claimed the right of private judgment, that was not ready to submit to the opinion of the many.

The, "liberty of the Spirit," which you taught; by which you established the principle, that if one claimed conscience, or a sense of duty, to do a thing, no one had a right to call it in question; was, so far as it related to Friends' principles, essentially infidel. The end of such teaching is always to scatter and disintegrate. It fosters infidelity on the one hand, and license on the other, by putting *all* opinions on a level: by practically saying that *error* is as good as truth, it in effect teaches, that there is *no such* thing as *truth*. McLeod Campbell says of this infidel Toleration, that:—"It bears the same relation to Infidelity, that a demand for a blind faith does to Superstition," and that, "In its full developement the one shall bear as bitter fruit as the other has ever borne."

THE TOLERATION OF EARLY FRIENDS.

I note, that in thy efforts to justify thyself from early Friends, thou entirely overlooks the fact,

that the ground of union with early Friends, was, "convincement of their principles;" so that there could be no occasion, with them, for the Toleration for which thou contends. The Toleration they exercised, was entirely in the nature of *charity* for ignorance and inexperience; and not a, "liberty of conscience," prompted by holding such Baptist, and *semi*-Baptist views of the outward ordinances, as thou does, that *their* views, of *their* entire spiritual nature, were *paralyzed* by indifference as to their observation; and this is so evident from the history of early Friends, that it is surprising, that a man of thy intelligence should seek to justify thyself by getting behind them.

The only instance, in the history of the rise of Friends, that even seems to afford the least bit of positive support for thy position, is given by the late R. Barclay in his, "Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth," page 373; in the case of Humphrey Wooldrig, a minister among Friends, who in 1658 baptized a woman. But this woman was not a *convinced Friend*; for Wooldrig says of her, "That the Spirit by which the Baptists are led did not *convince her*;" "*only she desired me to baptize her with water.*" This act of Wooldrig was at once, so strongly condemned by early Friends, that George Fox was censured for not

disowning him. In his own defense, Fox wrote, that the reason he, “did not *utterly deny* Humphrey’s *wrong* and *deny him*,” was because, he, “simply did it *once* and *no more*.” When George Fox calls this act a “*wrong*”; and says that the reason he did not, “*utterly deny it and him*,” was because he “did it *once and no more*,” it is clear, that this case, not only does not support thy theory of Toleration; but that it affords the strongest proof, that George Fox, and the early Friends, did *not* tolerate the *practice* of water baptism in the Society of Friends.

In the section of the Apology preceding the one thou quotes from, about being, “indulged,” Robert Barclay gives the ground of indulgence to be because, their, “understandings have been clouded with these ceremonies;” the true mystery being, “veiled, from their *sticking to such outward things*.”

In William Penn’s Reply to Faldos’ Vindication, he says: “Water baptism was the *prologue* to Christ’s visible appearance, and when he was come, a kind of outward testimonial, or signification of their belief in the visible appearance of the then so much denied, so cruelly derided and crucified Jesus; wherefore I say it *was not evangelical* but an introductory ceremony suited to the external state of things in *that day* which in some competent time

SO VARIED that there could be NO PRETENSE of CHRISTIAN PRUDENCE for *perpetuating the practice of it*; MUCH LESS any reason for its *Institution*. Penn's Works, Folio, vol. ii, p. 403. In view of the *varieties* of belief amongst those who claim to believe in water baptism; about *how* it is to done, what it is *for*, *who* is to receive it, and *who* is to administer it—which age-long controversies seem no nearer settlement among the water advocates now than in the days of William Penn—if he could say, in his day, that the use of water “*so varied*,” that “there could be no *pretense of christian prudence for perpetuating the practice*,” certainly, we as his successors ought to add a, “MUCH LESS,” does “christian prudence *now* afford a “pretense,” for Friends to join in, “perpetuating the practice.”

Barclay's Anarchy of the Ranters; William Penn's Liberty in Spirituals; and Stephen Crisp's Against Seducing Spirits; were all written at the time of the difficulties about Wilkinson and Story; and against Toleration as thou now pleads it.

The language of Robert Barclay in, Anarchy of the Ranters, is so clear and full, on the right of individual freedom in matters of faith, that to me, it seems to cut away every particle of support for thy theory of Toleration. He says, “Were such a principle to be received or believed, that *in* the

church of Christ no man should be separated from, no man condemned, or excluded the fellowship and communion of the body for his judgment, or *opinion* in *matters of faith*, then what blasphemies so horrid, what *heresies* so *damnable*, what doctrines of devils, but might harbor itself *in the Church*?" After discussing the principles involved in such a claim, Barclay says, "Being gathered together into the belief of certain principles and doctrines, by the mere force of truth on the understanding and its power and *influence* upon our hearts:" "Therefore we conclude that whereas *any* in the church of God pretending *conscience* or *revelation*, shall arise to *teach* and *practice*, however *insignificant* or *small* principles or practices, yet if they be *contrary* to such as are *already received as true*"—anything, says Barclay from which "*visible schism*" and *dissension* may arise in the church;" or that "may bring reproach on the truth, or *stumble* the weak"—"Such as *stand* and *abide* firm in the faith have power by the Spirit of God," to "condemn," "judge," "cast out" and exclude them from "fellowship and communion;" and Barclay adds:—"If this be *denied farewell* to all christianity or to the maintaining of *any sound doctrine* in the church of Christ," Barclay's Works, Folio pp. 213–217. And William Penn says not to do this, "would be babel,"

and open the way for, "libertinism." These principles of Barclay, were openly opposed by one William Rogers, who wrote against Anarchy of the Ranters, and stated his views of Toleration as follows:—"That every one should believe for himself, and practice without being imposed upon." This controversy brought the matter before the Second-Day's Meeting in London in 1677; when, after considering the whole matter, Robert Barclay was endorsed, in the following words: "It doth not appear to this meeting by any thing the said William Rogers hath objected or offered that there is *any error or unsoundness* in Robert Barclay's book;" and they condemned Rogers and his book, by saying that; "William Rogers ought *forthwith* to deliver up, into the hands of James Claypool, that copy of his said book which he hath here with him—and as *speedily* as may be, recall all such other copies as he knows to be dispersed in the nation and elsewhere." Thirty three members agreed with this decision; among whom are the names of Stephen Crisp, Thomas Elwood, Charles Marshall, Ambrose Rigge, John Burnyeat, and William Penn. Barclay's Vindication Works Folio page 250. On page 201 of same, in Anarchy of the Ranters, Barclay names, "Water Baptism and Bread and Wine" as, "*customs forms and shadows,*" which, "We confess we are

against such as seek to uphold," "when the substance itself is known and witnessed." Seeing in the first place; that the principles of Anarchy of the Ranters is utterly opposed to thy theory of Toleration; that *it* was approved by the London Second Day's Meeting under a presentation of views, precisely similar to those now advocated by thyself; and that *Water Baptism* and *Bread and Wine* were enumerated in this work as things which Friends "were against;" there is therefore, no ground whatever, for thy theory, that early Friends permitted the practice of the outward ordinances. Let us now recall the fact that George Fox calls the only known case of baptism by an early Friend a, "*wrong*;" and implies, that he would have, "utterly denied him and it" if Wooldrig had "did it more than once;" and that William Penn said the practice "so varied," even in his time, that there could be no, "pretense," of "Christian prudence" for its perpetuation, much less for its institution: and lay these facts, along side the principles of Anarchy of the Ranters, and its notable endorsement by the London Second Day's Meeting, in direct opposition to thy theory of Toleration, as presented by Rogers; and it seems utterly impossible to believe, that there is any warrant for thy theory of Toleration of the ordinances, in either the teaching, or the practice of the early Friends.

CHAPTER II.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.

As thou requested it, I have given careful, "attention to thy argument on John's Baptism," in the Address before Ohio Yearly Meeting. I observe that thy "views"—as distinctions go among those who hold to water baptism—are chiefly "Baptist views;" and that like the Baptists, thou seeks to exalt the mission and ministry of John the Baptist, by making it "evangelical," in order to obtain a foundation upon which to construct *thy system* of water Baptism.

After considering all thou has said, I must say in love, that my impression is that if to *assume* is to argue, thou has made a case in favor of water baptism; but if it is *not* thou *has not*. Much of what thou says might be classed as "*petitio principii*," but on account of conclusions assumed without proof it really belongs in that class of fallacy known as "*ignoratio elenchi*." Among thy conclusions of this class are thy numerous definitions of the *object* of water Baptism, not *one* of which has a line of scripture to support it; that, "John's ministry was without the slightest reference to the law," for we

are told that he lost his head because, he told Herod that it was not, "*lawful* for him to have his brother's wife"; that water baptism was, "a moral Rubicond by which all hope of help from Moses was surrendered," for we are told that James said, at the time Paul was arrested at Jerusalem;—"There are many thousands of Jews that believe and they are all *zealous* of the law;" thy mistake about the, "consecration of the Priests," in the days of John the Baptist, for the consecration thou refers to was only a special consecration for Aaron and his sons, and was no more repeated with the common priests in Israel; and thy blunder about George Elliott, in thy illustration about marriage, for George Elliott was a woman and not a "himself;" the name being only a pseudonym. The principles that underlie these conclusions and undue assumptions, and all else said about John the Baptist are answered in what follows.

Almost the whole of thy argument proceeds upon the assumption, that the ministry of John the Baptist marks the dividing line between the Law and the Gospel. But the Apostle Paul declares that Christ "*abolished* the law in his flesh," "*blotted out* the handwriting, took it out of the way *nauling* it to the cross;" therefore I deny thy assumption, and on the authority of Paul assert, that the Cross of Christ on Calvary was the dividing line between the Law and the Gospel.

John the Baptist was not, even, in the kingdom of heaven, unless thou can successfully contradict the words of Jesus, and assert the logical absurdity, that he was *greater* than *himself*; for Jesus said, "the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." And the ministry of John was not evangelical, in the true Gospel sense; because Peter declares that:—"The preaching of *peace* by *Jesus Christ* BEGAN *from Gallilee* AFTER the baptism which John preached."

Zacharias the father of John the Baptist was an officiating Priest, and his mother was a, "daughter or Aaron," in the line of the High Priesthood; but thou seeks to break the force of the fact, that John was a Priest, by disparaging the priestly, and exalting his prophetic office; but I fail to see with what avail, for Christ was to "*fulfill both the law and the prophets,*"

Thou attempts to make an evangelical minister of John the Baptist; but we are explicitly told by John the apostle, "That the Holy Spirit was *not yet given* because Jesus was not yet justified;" and the apostles could not proclaim the evangelical message of a "crucified Christ," until they, "tarried at Jerusalem, and received the Spirit poured upon them;" therefore the prophetic gift of the Holy Ghost, of John the Baptist, was *not* evangelical or

"*inspired*" in the New Testament sense, but in the Old Testament or Prophetic sense, like Samson or David, or Samuel, or Elijah, and all the Prophets, and holy men of old, "who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost!"

One of thy chief arguments in support of thy theory of the mission of John the Baptist is based upon the expressed assumption that John; "had never been consecrated a priest *at all* or paid the *slightest attention* to the Jewish ritual since he was circumcised." To this remarkable statement I reply first: that according to Paul, if he *was* circumcised, "he was *debtor do the whole law*;" and second: that the consecration to which thou so minutely refers, was a special consecration, by Moses for Aaron and his sons, to initiate them into the priesthood, which was never repeated after the days of Aaron. Lange on Leviticus says, "The one consecration answering for all his descendents and was *not repeated*." (p. 68.) As there was no consecration required as thou asserts, thy argument based upon it falls to the ground. But, John; was, however, from his birth, under the consecration of the Nazarite vow for life. Luke i. 15. In a note on John the Baptist, Lange says; "The Nazarite vow was a higher completion of the legal priesthood." Geikie says; The life long Nazarite stood on an equality with a

priest and might enter into the inner temple." Jeremiah said of them in the golden days of Israel; "Her Nazarites were whiter than snow." As John the Baptist was a Priest by birth, and also a Nazarite; as no consecration was needed; he was therefore *doubly* qualified for priestly service; instead of *disqualified* as thou attempts to show.

To thy assertion that John paid not the, "slightest attention to the Jewish ritual," I answer that he could not have kept his Nazarite vow without the *utmost care* to observe it *all*. Geikie, thy favorite authority, says of John: "He grew up with a religious reverence for its minutest prescriptions, its feasts and fasts, its sabbaths and new moons, its ten thousand rules on meats and drinks." Again he says:—"John the Baptist was trained like Paul in all the perfect knowledge and observance of the law, he was doubtless like him a zealot towards God in all things" and "he sought the wilderness at once to receive perfect Levitical purity."

Thou thinks it "strange" that any should raise the question or imply that John the Baptist was restoring the things of the Mosaic law. But this question *was* raised by the apostles, after the transfiguration, and answered by Christ Himself. Mark says; "He answered and told them, Elias verily cometh first and *restoreth all things* * * but

"I say unto you that Elias is indeed come ix, 12; Mathew says, "Jesus answered and said unto them Elias truly shall *first* come and RESTORE ALL *things*, but I say unto you Elias is come already." xvii, 11. It seems to my mind that these statements of what John the Baptist was to do, are as clear and definite, as was possible to make them; and as the Jews had, had *only* the *first*, or Mosaic covenant; there was consequently *nothing else* for John to RESTORE! And this ought to be finally conclusive on this point, to every believer in the holy Scriptures.

JOHN'S MISSION.

The mission of John the Baptist was to "prepare the way," and "manifest Christ to Israel." And as he "fulfilled his course," he was to baptize with water, until he saw the "Spirit descending and remaining on him." And when he saw the Spirit so remain on Jesus of Nazareth, he at once recognized Christ as *come*; and his own mission as his forerunner as accomplished; by crying, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

"GOSPEL MESSAGE."

This grand message of John the Baptist, like the one, "He that believeth on the son hath everlasting life," on which thou bases thy assumptions that

John's was a gospel ministry; were both spoken by him after his mission of "preparing the way," for, and "manifesting Christ to Israel," had been fulfilled. The latter is the last utterance of John the Baptist concerning Christ. And if it was admitted, as thou says, that it was a "gospel message," and "totally new to Israel," it would not effect the main question of his mission and ministry while "preparing the way," and "manifesting Christ to Israel" by his baptism with water; for this had already been accomplished. But if thou will examine the Scripture thou will find that John the Baptist bases even *this* "gospel message," upon the fact, that the "*seal*" of this *saving faith* was, that they had "*received His testimony*," "to whom God had given the Spirit without measure." Lange says of this last message of John the Baptist:—"It was the closing word of the Old Testament, the *last* peal of the thunder of the law, the FAREWELL of John the Baptist."

REPENTANCE AND REMISSION IN THE LAW.

In pursuance of thy purpose to exalt John's ministry and disparage the law, thou says; "There was no provision in the law," for a ministry like that of John the Baptist. But in the 18th chapter of Deut., thou will find "provision made in the law," for testing a Prophet, and for the exercise of the

prophetic office in Israel. And if thou wilt examine the law of Blessings and Cursings, Deut. chapters 27 to 30, thou wilt find, in the law, full provision for John's ministry of Repentance. Chapter 30 is a chapter on repentance. There provision is made in the law, that, though Israel may have turned away from the statutes of the law, and gone into captivity, that if "they *return* unto the Lord (*repentance*), and "keep his commandments with all thy *heart* and with all thy *soul*;" that the Lord would have "compassion," and "turn their captivity" (*remission of sins*); and give them "*life*" and "CIRCUMCISE THEIR HEARTS" (*conversion*). What more! I ask, could there be in the "repentance," "remission of sins," and "moral renovation" in John's ministry than is here provided for in the law? The mission of John was to "prepare the way," for Christ by preaching repentance and remission of sins; and manifesting Christ by baptizing with water; but Jesus said his mission was to "RESTORE ALL THINGS." If his preaching and Baptism were *both* something *new*; as thou claims, I think thou wilt never be able to tell what the *all things* were which John RESTORED.

The presence in the law of this promise to circumcise their hearts when they truly repented, or

turned to the Lord, as required by the law; the frequent occurrence of the same thought, in the warnings of the Prophets; as for example, in Isaiah's call of Israel to repentance:—"Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings, cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." With the promise, that, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow, though they be red like crimson they shall be as wool." Isaiah i, 16. This was preceded by a condemnation of mere rites so sweeping, that even their "solemn meetings were iniquity" and their "fasts a burden" to the Lord. On account of these things I may say that it seems strange, that thou could be betrayed into so palpable a contradiction of both the Law and the Prophets as to assert that there was no "experimental knowledge" of "repentance" and "remission of sins" until John's ministry. Such a declaration eliminates all the spirituality from the Psalms of David; and makes them only an enigma in the old Testament; and robs them of the precious comfort, that has cheered the hearts of the saints in all ages. We search history in vain for a prayer of penitence, forgiveness, and restoration exceeding that of the Psalmist David:—"Purge

me with hyssop and I shall be clean, *wash me* and I shall be whiter than snow. *Hide* thy face from my *sins*, and blot out all mine iniquities. *Create* in me a *clean heart*, O God; and *renew* a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy *presence*; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation: and *uphold* me with thy free Spirit. Psalms, li.

THE HIGHER RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW.

In the midst of this chapter on repentance and remission of sins, occurs that declaration of Moses, "The word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart that thou mightest do it," which Paul quotes in the 10th of Romans as the speaking of "the righteousness which is of faith." On which Lange makes the observation that, "The truth of the *inward essence of the law*, like that of the gospel, and therefore of the whole saving revelation is based on its inward character—on ITS INWARD union with the *inward nature of man*." If the repentance, remission, faith, and righteousness of this "*Inward essence of the law*," was so perfect, that Paul holds it up to the Jews, for whom his "Desire was that they might be saved," as a representation of the gospel; John the Baptist in fulfilling his mission of "*restoring all things*," and "turn-

ing the disobedient to the wisdom of the just,' would find *all* the material for his ministry in the Law and the Prophets.

Jesus said, "Before Abraham was I am;" and Paul said of Israel in the wilderness, "They drank of that *Spiritual* rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." And we do well to remember that this "inward essence of the law"—"the word of faith nigh in the mouth and in the heart"—the "commandment that was *not* up in heaven or over the deep," is also, by *allusion* twice referred to by this same great apostle, as *Christ*. And when John the Baptist, "Preaching the Baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins," "Cried saying he that cometh after me is preferred before me, *for he was before me*;" and then, including *himself* with the *masses* of *Israel*, declares; "And of his *fullness* have ALL WE *received* and *grace for grace*; (John i, 16.) he gives the *only* statement of the spiritual basis of his ministry of repentance and remission to be found in the Scriptures; and like Moses and Paul he bears witness to this *higher righteousness* of the law. I know that some modern Comments, probably to get *rid* of this doctrine of John, seek by a technical construction of the word *and*, to refer this verse to the Apostle; but at least six of the

oldest Manuscripts, and Grieshback, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Origen, Chrysostom, with Erasmus, Luther, Melancthon and Lange—thy own witness—unite that it belongs to the preaching of John the Baptist: and the New Version sustains these by actually changing the “and” to “for.”

By thy scheme of water baptism, all these evidences of the spiritual side of the law; and the wonderful mission of John the Baptist in preparing the way of Christ by “*restoring all*” these higher *things* of the law; are utterly ignored, in order to make an evangelical basis for water baptism, by setting up the contradictory claim, that his ministry was *not* of the law.

JOHN'S BAPTISM WITH WATER NOT GOSPEL RIGHTEOUSNESS.

The main fact upon which thou seems to rely for proof that the water baptism of John the Baptist was *not* a usage of the law; but a “new and striking requirement,” first “introduced” by John, is, that the Pharisees and lawyers were not baptized with it. But all the supposed support for thy position afforded by this fact, is at once destroyed by the additional fact, that these Pharisees did “come to John's Baptism,” and he called them a “generation of vipers” and rejected them because; they

lacked the "fruits meet for repentance." And the way they objected to Christ afterwards, affords abundant proof, for the reverse of thy proposition: That if it had been a "new requirement," and *not* of the law, these sensitive guardians of the Law and its traditions would have been the first to vehemently object to John's Baptism, on this account.

But in spite of this fallacious argument, and the evident misapplication of the *fact* as above shown, yet on such doubtful argument—so doubtful, that the words "flimsy subterfuge" which thou applies to thy opponents seem applicable—thou asserts that "water baptism was one element in the righteousness which John was sent to proclaim;" which Christ in receiving, "especially acknowledged," not as a part of "any law in existence" but for "our sakes" that "he might give all men an example of fulfilling and obeying," what thou calls, "the righteousness announced by John, instead of that by Moses."

Moses said, "It shall be our righteousness if we observe to do *all* these commandments." The righteousness of the law consists in many things, besides rites and ceremonies. Christ justified the Pharisees for paying tithes of "mint, anise and cummin," but condemned them for neglecting "the

weightier matters of the law;" these Mathew gives as "judgment, mercy and *faith*;" and Luke adds "the love of God." There was therefore a "faith," love, mercy and judgment, belonging to the law. Jesus said "One *jot* or *tittle* shall in no wise *pass* from the law, till *all be fulfilled*;" he pronounced a woe for its violation; he observed it himself; and sent a man whom he had cleansed to make the offering, which Moses commanded;" therefore, instead of the law, or the Mosaic Institution being in "fragments" or in "ruin," as thou would have us believe: it was *all in full force* both by His commandment and the most explicit recognition of Christ Jesus; until by his death it was "nailed to the cross;" and the "veil of the Temple was rent in twain from top to bottom;" God by miracle thus signifying its fulfillment. John the Baptist came with the "higher righteousness of the law," as the spiritual basis of his ministry, of repentance and remission of sins, as has already been shown; and he came also in the "way of the righteousness" of the "observance of all the commandments of the law," as Moses commanded and so fulfilled his mission of RESTORING ALL THINGS.

But when, as all Bible critics know, in the Greek Testament, the word "baptism" is used

to represent the "divers washings" of the Mosaic law in Heb. ix 10, in Mark vii 4-5, and Luke xi 38. (The New Version so gives it in the margin of Mark vii 4-5); and Paul the *only* one of the Apostles of whom there is a particle of Scripture evidence that he was ever baptized in water, tells us in his report of what Ananias said to him, that he commanded him to "Baptize himself;" for Conybeare and Howson's Life of Paul, vol II. p. 257 give the Greek word as in the "middle voice;" and Hadley's Grammar says, "The middle voice represents the subject as *acting upon itself*." In view of the fact that "baptism" is used in the Scriptures for all the "divers washings" of the law; and that Paul says he was commanded to "*baptize himself*," which Joseph John Gurney, on the authority of Maimonides, affirms was the Jewish mode of Baptism. I therefore assert that there is no Scripture warrant whatever for the assertion that John's Baptism was not a Jewish application of water, similar to the *divers washings* of the law and administered or received in precisely the same way.

In view of what has been shown of the "righteous of the law," its repentance, remission and change of heart; and that Christ refers to *its faith, mercy,*

and *love* of God; and that the Scriptures refer to the Jewish washings with water as Baptisms. I believe I assert the plain Scripture truth, when I say that there is no Scripture warrant for affirming that John's ministry or water baptism, was either a gospel ministry or gospel "righteousness."

The application of water was a most important part of the ceremonial law; as well known as circumcision, sacrifices, or its feasts. And the whole tenor of the Scripture teaching about Christ fulfilling the law, shows that he observed the law; submitting to its ordinances, and keeping its commandments, not because he was *impure* or *sinful*, but to "*fulfill* the righteousness of the law." And there is no reason whatever to believe that there was a particle more evangelical virtue in the water Baptism to which Christ submitted; than there was in his circumcision; or in his keeping the Jewish feasts; or when the Virgin Mary offered the "burnt offering" and the "sin offering" for herself and the child Jesus. Luke ii, 22; which Laage on Leviticus says, "was like his Baptism to fulfill all righteousness;;, or than there was in his crucifixion by Pilate, whereby he fulfilled all the "righteousness" of the law of sacrifice. The climax of this work of "fulfilling the righteousness" of the law,

was reached when on the cross Jesus cried "*It is finished*" and "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom." Up to this moment by the words of Jesus *not* a "jot or a tittle" of it had passed away because it was *not all* fulfilled.

PAUL ON THE COVENANTS.

To give evangelical character to John's ministry, and make the institution of water Baptism as a gospel ordinance, to depend upon it, is to make the *new* Covenant *lap back* on the *old* Covenant, and have the *institutes* of both in force at the same time. This is all wrong. It does violence to the profound and variously stated argument of the apostle Paul on the Covenants:—"That so long as the First Covenant—the first tabernacle that *stood* only in meats and drinks and divers washings was still standing—the way into the holiest *was* NOT *yet* made manifest; that the first Covenant was to be *taken away* that the "second" might be established; that a *Testament is of no strength at all while the testator liveth*—of "*force*" only "*after men are dead*;" that like as Moses *dedicated* the first Covenant by blood, so also Christ's Covenant was to be dedicated by his "*own blood*;" that by Christ's death the "*enmity*"—the law of commandments contained in ordinances, was "*taken away*," being

nailed to his cross; that Israel was "kept under the law SHUT UP unto the faith which should AFTERWARD be revealed;" forgetting all this then seeks to *overlap* the Covenants; to establish the second while the first was still standing; to put "force" and "strength" into the Testament before the death of the Testator; to inherit by the *new will*, before the *old will* was repealed; to Probate the new *will*, before the death of its Maker; to enter upon the inheritance before the appointment of an administrator; when the Spirit, the "earnest of the inheritance" was "not yet given;" neither as Administrator was he "dividing his gifts to every man as he will." By such methods thou labors to *carry* over John's Baptism of water *into*, and fasten it ON, and *perpetuate* it, in the dispensation of the gospel.

"TO FULFILL."

The assertion thou makes about "Water baptism being an element of righteousness" is similar to that of most advocates of water Baptism, and has probably led more people to accept or submit to the various modes of water Baptism, than any other one thing ever adduced in its favor. But before any warrant can be found for this theory of a "new righteousness;" every thing that

has been said about John, or his ministry, or the Covenants must be utterly ignored. The word which in this connection is translated "fulfill" is used 51 times in the New Testament in its true sense of to *end* or *complete*; but to apply it as thou does to a "new Righteousness," is to *reverse* its meaning, and make it mean to *establish* instead of to *end*. If there is Scripture authority for such assumption it ought to be given; but none is given. And it seems to me that nothing, but the helplessness of the advocates of water Baptism could ever have induced them to so reverse the meaning of the word "fulfill;" and to so ignore the true relation of the Covenants as to assert a new or gospel "righteousness while the, Righteousness of the law" was still in force.

BAPTISM OF REPENTANCE.

Thou says in, "Open Letters," to Lyman Abbott and and confirms it in thy Address by a reference to Josephus, that the work of the Spirit through John's ministry was the "*baptism* of repentance for the remission of sins." In view of what I have said of John's ministry I am quite prepared to agree *with thee*, that the baptism which John *preached* was the, "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." It appears from Mathew,

Mark, Peter at the household of Cornelius, and Paul at Antioch in Pisidia, that this distinction, from the Baptism which he *practiced* is Apostolic. Dale in his great work on, "Johannic Baptism," says; "There was no more water in the baptism that John preached than may be found in the burned out craters of the moon." Page 407.

OBJECT OF JOHN'S BAPTISM.

But none of these Scripture declarations about the, "Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," is as clear and definite; as the declaration of John the Baptist of the object of his water Baptism. When the question was asked; "Why baptizeth thou then?" He answered the question for his own time, and *all* time, by saying, That "*he might be made manifest unto Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.*" But as it does not suit thy purpose to leave this definition of its object as John the Baptist left it; in the total absence of all Scripture authority; thou, with much fertility of imaginative resource, invents a variety of things as its object; such as, a "uniting," "separating," "negative," "memorial," "incorporating" rite, a "moral vow," a "moral Rubicond," a "public espousal," a "figure of identity," a "symbol," a "memorial pointing backward;"—variety enough

surely—but with no better foundation than thy own opinion, or the opinion of other Baptists, who by such inventions, seek to justify their views, and perpetuate the practice of water Baptism in the Christian Church.

That there is no Scripture definition of the object of water Baptism given subsequent to this declaration by John the Baptist, by either Christ or the Apostles, is proved beyond the need of further demonstration, by the many contradictory views, about *how* the water is to be applied; *what* it is for; *who* is to receive it; and *who* is to apply it; which *now divides* the believers in water baptism, into warring factions; and has always divided those engaged in the great Baptismal controversy, which has gone on with out abatement, from the days of the first Baptismal, “dispute between John’s disciples and a Jew about purifying,” down to these *last* added inventions of thy own.

To the fact that there is no definition of water Baptism by Christ or the Apostles, we should join the fact which I have before pointed out, that the Priests, Levites and Pharisees, so zealous of the Law, and so ready to object to Christ, and accuse and find fault with him, for the least appearance of neglect or violation of the law, never found fault

or objected to water Baptism as used by John the Baptist; but so worded their questions as to imply that they expected, "Elias or that prophet" to Baptize. And to these facts let us join the all important one that water Baptism, as given by Mathew, Mark, Luke, and John; and spoken of by Jesus, Peter and Paul; was, "John's Baptism." And the same authorities as, uniformly designate Holy Ghost Baptism as Christ's Baptism. As there is not a *verse, word* or *line* of Holy Scripture that refers to water Baptism as *Christ's Baptism*, the testimony of these seven witnesses agreeing with the words of John the Baptist that, "I indeed baptize you with water but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost," Mark i, 8, *ought to be conclusive* that, Holy Ghost Baptism and *not water Baptism* is the Baptism of Christ and his Gospel.

In *thus* seeking to give water Baptism an evangelical character, by assuming its introduction and institution by John the Baptist; thou fails to remember the force of the teaching of the Transfiguration, that as, in the vision of the apostles, John the Baptist *stood* with Moses and *vanished* with him, leaving Jesus *alone*; so however *much*, thou and other Baptists, may seek to exalt the dispensation of John the Baptist, its authority was, like that of Moses, to *vanish*

away with it, leaving Jesus and the Gospel *alone*.

QUESTION OF JESUS.

Thou quotes the query of Jesus; "The Baptism of John whence was it? From heaven or of men?" And as an objection against the proposition, that it was only one of the "divers baptisms" of the Jewish Covenant; thou says, "Moses is included with all other men. There is no third alternative. If it is from Moses it is *not* from heaven, which is to break the Scriptures which declare that John was 'sent from God' and 'sent to baptize.'" It would be difficult to *compress* into equal space more absurd and illogical assumptions, under the guise of arguments, than is found in this statement. Moses *was* a *man*; so *was* John the Baptist. So that every statement about Moses is equally applicable to John the Baptist. If, because, "John was sent from God," "his baptism was from heaven," as thou asserts, the same argument will prove *all* the Mosaic law from heaven, because Moses was also, "sent from God." Out of the Burning Bush God said to Moses, "Thou shall say unto the Children of Israel *I AM* hath sent me unto you." Paul said, "The law was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." So there is *no need* for a "third alternative;" for if John's Baptism was from either John or Moses it was "from heaven" because both *men* had been "sent from

God." The fact that Moses and John stood together, shows the *equality* of their *missions* in the divine regard; and also that both were but preliminary Dispensations, to the Gospel of Christ.

JOHN'S NEED.

"I indeed baptize you with water, but one *mightier* than I cometh after me, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost," were the words with which John the Baptist disparaged himself and his water Baptism, and by contrast, exalted Christ and His Baptism with the Holy Ghost. And it was evidently this *clear view* of the exalted "*mightiness*," and divine agency in Holy Ghost Baptism—without any thought of his own water Baptism—that led John the Baptist to say to Jesus, "I have need to be baptized of thee," when Jesus came to be baptized. This recognition by John the Baptist of the "*need*," of the *Baptism of Christ*, in direct contrast with his own Baptism with water, is a striking and significant indication that the "*need*" of *all* men is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and *not* water Baptism. And this view of the universal necessity of Holy Ghost Baptism, drawn from John's confession of "*need*," is strengthened by the answer of Jesus, "*Suffer* it to be so *now* for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness;" which Lange on this text says, "Must evidently refer to Old Testament

righteousness." This has already been explained at length.

THE DECREASE OF JOHN.

John the Baptist represented his *inferior* relation to Christ under the figure of "The *friend* of the bridegroom;" and it was in connection with this illustration, that he uttered the words, "He must increase, but I must decrease." According to Oriental custom, the *friend* of the bridegroom, arranged the preliminaries of a marriage. But when the "bridegroom's voice was heard;" the work of the "friend" was ended. As the influence of the "*friend*" *decreased* at the coming of the bridegroom, so John was to *decrease*. And as the bridegroom *superseded* the "friend," and *increased* in influence with the bride, so Jesus was to *increase* with the Church. By this figure of John the Baptist, there is under this principle of *decrease*, no more need of John's Water Baptism at this time than there is for the antiquated preliminaries, of a marriage, after the marriage is accomplished. John the Baptist stood at the end of the Old Covenant, and referred to himself as "of the earth;" and to Christ as "from heaven." And the perpetual operation, of this law of his *decrease*, is the *decrease* of the *Old* and the *earthly*; and the law of the *increase* of Christ is the *increase* of the *New* and the *divine*.

Thou so far overlooks these principles of *increase* and *decrease* as to affirm that, "Christ's Baptism was to *succeed* not to *surpersede* John's." But from the immeasurably greater *authority* of Jesus, by the foregoing illustration of John, and from the meaning of the word *supersede*; it would be almost literally true, to affirm that Christ *succeeded* John by *superseding* him.

CONCLUSIONS.

I. The Apostle Paul teaches that the old covenant was *abolished* by being *nailed* to the cross; making the cross of Christ the dividing line between the Old and the New Covenants.

II. John the Baptist was under the Old Covenant; *not* in the kingdom of heaven; debtor to do the whole, law both by his circumcision and his Nazarite vow; in the Priesthood; needing no consecration, and so doubly qualified to act as a priest.

III. His mission was to *restore* all things, no thing could be restored to the Jews, but such as they had had before. As they had had only the Old Covenant, John's mission was to RESTORE it.

IV. The *spiritual* side of the law, the *higher righteousness*, which Paul quotes, as the speaking of the righteousness of faith, was the basis of John's ministry of the remission of sins, and was a part of the all things he restored.

V. The righteousness which Jesus fulfilled, was

not new or gospel righteousness, but legal or Old Testament righteousness; because it would be a wrong use of the word fulfill to apply it to a new righteousness; and it would make the *Institutes* of *two* covenants in *force* at the same time, in violation of the apostolic teaching on the Covenants.

VI. John the Baptist defined the object of his *water* Baptism to be to manifest Christ to Israel. And as there is no other definition in Scripture of its object; as it is when ever alluded to always distinguished as John's Baptism, while Christ's Baptism is always spoken of as Holy Ghost Baptism, it is best to leave this distinction; and the object of the water, just as it is left in the Holy Scriptures. This would relieve the church of all the numerous *unscriptural* definitions of the object of water Baptism.

VII. Moses and John the Baptist were both men; both sent from God. Whatever either done was equally from heaven or from God. They both stood together on the Mount of Transfiguration as equals, and vanished together, leaving Jesus alone; showing that their dispensations were preliminary to that of the gospel.

VIII. Water was used under the law, and its use is in the Greek text frequently called Baptism; and there is not a line of Scripture to show that John's use of water was any thing more—or

differently administered—than the “divers baptisms” practiced under the law. And as the Scribes, Pharisees and Levites, did not object to it, it is strong presumptive proof that it was of the law and familiar to them.

IX. The affirmation of John the Baptist of his *need* of Christ's Baptism, and that Christ should *increase* while he should *decrease*—and this under the figure of the “Friend of the bridegroom” shows the uselessness and inefficacy of water Baptism; for it was only preliminary to the “voice of the bridegroom”—of the gospel—by whom our joy like that of John the Baptist is to be fulfilled.

THE WORD BAPTISM.

I have given this review of thy assumptions about the mission, ministry and character of John the Baptist, because almost one half of all thou says about water Baptism is in connection with these things; and about *all* else said is based upon them. This letter is already too long; but so many of thy statements about *water Baptism*, such as it was, “introduced by John the Baptist;” “that it has no history beyond him;” that it “never was a type of any thing;” that “it never was a type of Holy Ghost Baptism;” that the “word baptize always means an outward act;” and much more of the same nature: are so extravagantly reckless, that I

have concluded to examine the question of the use of *water* as a *religious rite*; the meaning of *water* as a type; and the history of the word *baptism* in *this* letter, on account of its intimate relation to the mission of John the Baptist; instead of delaying it until treating the main question of, "What is Gospel Baptism?" where it more properly belongs.

Thou says in Address with emphasis of italics, that the word "baptism" is *always* used in its *natural* and *literal* meaning of an *outward act*;" and in like manner emphasizes the word "immersion" in "Open Letters." This is a theory of some water advocates so long ago exploded, or proved false by investigation into the Classic usage of the word "baptize," that it seems strange, that one who had investigated this Baptismal question, enough, to enter into the *confusion* of the water baptism controversy, at this late date, as a fresh convert, would make it. Thou must have borrowed it from some "old Baptist Catechism" for it is one of the *oldest* of "Baptist traditions."

Baptism is a Greek and not a Hebrew word. For more than two hundred years—at least since the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus it had been used among the Jews. In the Septuagint Translation of the Old Testament, from Hebrew into Greek, made at this early date; in Kings, where the Proph-

et Elisha commanded Naaman the Syrian to "go wash seven times in Jordan;" it reads that Naaman "went down and *baptized* himself seven times in Jordan." In the Apocrapha of the same Version the Jewish captive Judith, while in the army of Holofernes; is said to have "went out nightly into the valley of Bethulia and *baptized* herself in the camp *at* the fountain of water." The book of Sirach xxxiv, 25, says "Being *baptized* from a dead body and touching it again what is he benefited by his cleansing?" At this early date we find the word "*baptism*" thus used to represent the Jewish *washings, bathings* and *sprinklings* for religious or ceremonial purification. Therefore for more than two hundred years "*baptism*" as a Greek word had had been taking on its meaning of a *Jewish rite of purification*; with these *examples* in their popular Version of the Old Testament. Josephus in Antiquities of the Jews, used the word "baptize" according to Classic signification, five times, "Baptized in sleep," "Sword baptized," three times "drowned by baptism," twice "killed by baptism," "drunk by baptism." Philo uses it also in this latter sense, and also says, "baptized by gluttony;" Josephus also speaks of being "baptized by *drunkenness* into sleep;" and of Herod's murdered sons as "killed by baptism." But when Josephus refers to Jewish purifications he uses the word baptize as it is used

in the Septuagint. Referring to those defiled by touching a dead body, Josephus says, that "Introducing a little of the ashes and a hyssop branch into a spring, and *baptizing* of this ashes they sprinkle both on the third and seventh day."

Thou asserts in a way well calculated to deceive, that Josephus never said any thing about "Proselyte baptism," as if the whole case *rested* on the proof of *such* baptism. It is utterly immaterial whether such a baptism *did*, or *did not* exist; when the word *baptize* is thus applied to the Jewish *purifications*, in the Septuagint Version of the Scriptures. And if thou will re-examine thy own quotation from Josephus, where thou says that, "even Josephus admits that John could not have baptized for the remission of sins in as much as the soul had been previously purified by righteousness," thou *ought* to be greatly surprised to see that by a *mere* accident thou left out a clause in the middle of the sentence, by which Josephus does most definitely state the object of John's Baptism in water, The whole sentence with the part so strangely omitted in italics reads as follows, "Not using it (baptism) for the remission of sins, *but for purity of the body*, providing that the soul had been previously purged by righteousness. Ant., xviii, 6-21.

We see above how Josephus and Philo have used

the word Baptize; but its use by Classic authors is even more varied. Plato speaks of himself, four hundred years before Christ, as, "one not baptized," and Plutarch, five hundred years after, uses the words, "not yet baptized," Isodorus three hundred years before Christ, speaks of, "men baptized in ignorance," Plutarch, "baptized by debts;" "baptized by excessive labors," and "baptized by worldly affairs." Other ancient writers, "baptized by calamity;" "baptized by anger," "baptized by cares," "baptized with taxes," "baptized with poverty," "baptized by desires," "baptized by grief;" and Timon the Misanthrope who said he loved Alcibiades because he would one day prove the ruin of Athens killed his victims by "baptizing them in water." In consideration of these evidences of the antiquity of the word, and the wonderful diversity of its use, it will easily be seen that thy assertion that its natural and literal meaning is an outward Act of immersion, is utterly at variance with the plainest facts of History. As is thy other statement that baptism has no history beyond John the Baptist. After adducing these and many other examples from ancient Classics and Jewish writers, Dale says, "Now can any one not *born in lunacy* and grown gray amid its phantasies *affirm* that all these baptisms are of one *nature—or act.*"

The foregoing examples of the Classic use of the word *baptize*; and its application without any limitation to the "divers washings" of the Jews, is conclusive proof that it was NOT "*always used*" as thou says, with a "*natural* and literal meaning of an *outward* act;" but that by those most familiar with its "*natural* and literal meaning," it was *always* modified in meaning by the condition, or thing, to be expressed. Thus it was adopted and introduced into the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament more than two hundred and fifty years before Christ, to represent Jewish purifications with water. And Josephus also adopts it and uses it for the same purpose; actually defining the baptism of John the Baptist to be "for the *purity* of the body."

In the light of these examples, from the Bible and Josephus, neither thou, or any other water advocate can successfully deny, or ignore the *fact* that the word baptize had been in use by the Jews, long before Christ, to represent the Jewish Purifications in water. And the familiar diversity of its use for this purpose, in the days of Christ and the apostles, is abundantly proved by the undeniable and significant *fact*, that the Holy Spirit *inspired* its use as a word to represent these purifications, in the Greek text of Mark vii 4, where we read of "baptizing themselves," and "baptizings"

—as in the margin of the New Version—of “cups, pots, and brazen vessels;” and in Luke xi 38, of the marvel of the Pharisees, because Jesus did not “baptize before dinner;” and in Hebrews ix 10, of the “divers baptisms” of the law; and in John iii 25, of the dispute of John’s disciples and the Jews about purifying, and the context shows that it was about *baptism*.

With the *fact* thus established, by the Old Testament and the New Testament, by Mark, and Luke, by Paul and John, and Josephus, that the word baptism was used for the Jewish purifications; both of their “traditions” and of the law; thy statement, and all thy argument based on it, that “not one single text is to be found in the law of Moses” showing that baptism was a Jewish rite, is so *unfair* and *delusive* as to be totally unworthy a place in the discussion of this question. For the word *baptism* is a Greek and not a Hebrew word; and when it was adopted by the Jews, and by the apostles, as seen above, for the Jewish purifications by water—this *fact alone*, at once carried “*baptism*” back into *all* the “*divers*” legal and traditional washings of the Jews.

Thou says in thy Address, that the “lustrations” practiced by the Jews were “body washings” for purification that they might be “ceremonially clean.”

But these *lustrations* were *baptisms*; and *this fact* destroys the foundation upon which all thy assertions are based, that, John's Baptism "was a *type* of nothing;" that baptism "was never a carnal ordinance;" that "the rite or ceremony of water baptism never put away any filth of the flesh." For *salvation* as it is experienced, through the redemption of Christ Jesus was represented in the *types*, *shadows* and *figures* of the Mosaic Law. In this *typical* and *figurative* salvation *water* was used in the "divers washings," for "ceremonial cleansing," typifying the *washing*, *cleansing* and *purification* of the Gospel; as the blood of the sacrifices was used as a type of the atoning blood of Christ, by which sin is forgiven and *guilt* taken away. Blood in the *types* of the law was for atonement and *guilt*; *water* was for uncleanness and *purification*. By the blood *guilt* was removed and pardon received. By the water uncleanness was removed and purification received. In the typical ceremonial redemption of the law, when *guilt* and *uncleanness* were joined, *both* water and blood were *always* required, either applied separately, or joined as in the "water of separation." The uncleanness for which the water was commanded in the law was touching the dead, leprosy, blood issue, and of the Priests and Levites; representing in the *type* our need of

purification from evil associations, corruption of the flesh, impurity in life, and for the service and worship of God.

Substituting the word *baptize*, for these "divers washings" as did Paul, and Mark, and Luke, and Josephus we obtain the following panoramic view of the wonderful *diversity* of these baptisms for *typical* purification.

The command of the law "to baptize their flesh or themselves" was for the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, once for himself and once for the people; for the one who led away the scapegoat into the wilderness; and for accidental uncleanness.

The command "to baptize their clothes," was for all Israel at the dedication of the law; for all the Levites when purified by the ashes of separation; for those who were even suspicioned of leprosy; for the one who gathered the ashes of the red heifer; and for whoever sprinkled the ashes of separation.

The command "to baptize *both* their clothes and their flesh:" was for the High Priest who cast the scarlet into the fire at the burning of the red heifer; for the one who burned it; for the one who burned the skin of the goat on the Day of Atonement; for the leper on the first day, and again on the seventh day of his cleansing; for one who touched a bone or the dead; for one who eat that that died of it-

self; and for the man or woman with blood uncleanness, or any one who touched a bed, clothes, or any thing of such persons, or was touched by them.

All vessels and garments touching a leper were to be twice baptized, once on the first, and again on the seventh day; and all other vessels or garments ceremonially unclean were to be once baptized; and the laver stood always in the Outer Court for the *daily* baptism of the Priests.

The most striking fact, at once apparent from this view of the "divers baptisms" of the law, is that the *type* of purification was in the *water*, *not* in the *manner* of its use; just the same as the *type* of atonement was in the *blood* not in the manner of slaying the sacrifice. The *water* used in these *typical* rites and ceremonies for purification was a *type* of the Holy Spirit—the spiritual water—its *anti-type* in the Gospel. For John says the Spirit is the *water* that Jesus gives, vii 39; Paul says we *drink* of the Spirit; Peter that the Spirit is *poured* out upon all flesh. If the Holy Spirit is the *anti-type* of the *water* used in the typical purification of the law; then the purification *by* the Holy Spirit is the *anti-type* of the purifications by water under the law; but the *first* is *true* so *also* is the *last*. And because of *this* the baptism of Christ was represented by John the Baptist, and by Christ and His

apostles as a spiritual work of *cleansing*, under the *figure* of a *fan* that should thoroughly *purge* his floor.

SPIRITUAL CLEANSING.

Paul makes the purpose of the coming of Christ to be, 'That the righteousness of the law might be *fulfilled in us*.' In christian experience our atonement for sin and guilt is by the "one offering;" and our cleansing from spiritual uncleanness is by the "One baptism." The *typical* cleansings, like all the *shadows* of the law, were *figures* of spiritual realities, which Paul describes as "good things," or "heavenly things" that were to come. But these outward cleansings, wrought by outward *water* were, as we have seen, by the Scriptures called "*baptisms*;" and when John the Baptists, as in Mathew, Mark, Luke and John, Jesus in Acts i, 5, and Peter in his report to the brethren at Jerusalem, of the matter at the house of Cornelius; *all* use the *same* word *baptism* for the cleansing work of the Holy Ghost, and that too in immediate connection and contrast with John's water baptism; it is abundantly evident that the cleansing of the Holy Ghost is the spiritual reality and *fulfillment in us* of the righteousness of the outward cleansings of the law; and therefore the *antitype* of the typical cleansings of the Old Testament. That the spiritual *cleansing*, which

was prefigured in the typical purifications of the ceremonial law, is Holy Ghost Baptism is proved by the words of John the Baptist, who proclaimed that the spiritual *effect* of Holy Ghost baptism would be to "THOROUGHLY CLEANSE" (new version, Matthew, iii, 12); and by Paul who represented the believers not only as *baptized* by the Spirit, but as "*washed*" and *sanctified* by it (1 Cor. vi, 11, and xii, 13, 2 Thes. ii, 13, and 1 Peter i, 2).

To re-state this argument in brief, if the spiritual cleansing by the Holy Ghost, is the cleansing *typified* by the ceremonial cleansing of the law, then the outward *water* used under the law was a type of the Holy Ghost; and its application for ceremonial cleansing was a type of Holy Ghost Baptism; but the first is true; therefore the last. To any who are disposed to cavil at this, we desire to press home the question, if the *water* was not a type of the Spirit, and its *use* for purification a type of Holy Ghost Baptism, of what *was* it a type? It could not have been a *type* or *shadow* of outward water *now*, no more than a *shadow* can make a *shadow*. It cannot refer to the blood of Christ, or to cleansing, by blood or washing away *sin* and *guilt*, for this was represented by the blood of the sacrifices in the typical law. It cannot stand for *fire* now, for fire in the *typical* law, and in all the

Old Testament, stood as the type of *Judgment*. Therefore we press the question, believing that no consistent Scripture answer can be found for it but the one we have given.

OLD TESTAMENT TYPES.

My dear friend D. B. Updegraff, thou makes the following remarkable statements about the rites of sacrifice and cleansing; and about blood, water, and fire, as *types* of the work of Christ in our salvation: 1. "That Christ suffered in his own person as the *anti-type* of every type for cleansing;" 2. that "water speaks of cleansing by the blood;" 3. that "we do not enter the family of the redeemed by baptism of any kind;" 4. that "whatever baptism it is, it is one which stands *immediately connected* with the new birth;" 5. that "Baptism with the Spirit does *not* stand connected with the new birth;" 6. that "it is received at some advanced period of the christian course," "at some subsequent time;" 7. that "the rite of Water Baptism never represented Holy Ghost Baptism;" 8. that "*fire* was the symbol of Holy Ghost Baptism from the earliest days of sacrifice down to Pentecost;" 9. that "the rite or ceremony of Water Baptism *never put away* any filth of the flesh, that such a thing never was thought of."

When I read these astonishing statements, and know that they are made for the double purpose of

fastening upon the Society of Friends, two of the greatest errors known to Church History; that of Water Baptism on the one hand and; the modern Sanctification theory, *mis called* Holy Ghost Baptism on the other; I am reminded of the words which an eminent author of English Literature puts into the mouth of one of his characters, when he makes him say: "I am as muddled a man as lives—you won't find a muddler man than me;" for it is inconceivable how any man, professing to be a Friend, could make such statements if not troubled in this way.

I say this, 1st. Because, sacrifices, blood, suffering and death, were always a type of atonement; while *water* and *cleansing* were the type of spiritual purification; so that suffering could *no more* be the "*antitype* of every type of cleansing," than *washing* could be the *anti-type* of every type of atonement. There is no more scripture or reason for one proposition than for the other. Thy assertion is *wholly* gratuitous and without any divine authority.

2nd. Because, blood always spoke of atonement, and water of cleansing. *Water no more* "speaks of cleansing by blood" than "blood speaks of *atonement* by *water*. Both these propositions are equal perversions of scripture truth. In the Old Testament water was always for purification, and blood for atonement; the water re-

moved uncleanness, the blood removed sin and guilt. And on examination of every text in the New Testament, where *cleansing or washing* by blood is stated or implied, either the text or the context shows that it *only* refers to the cleansing or washing away of *sin* and *guilt* and *not* uncleanness or impurity. "Washed from our sins," "cleanse your conscience," "sprinkled from an evil conscience," "cleanseth from all sin," through His blood forgiveness of *tresspasses*, "justified by His blood," is the way the *work* of the blood is given in the New Version: *always* referring to *sin* and *guilt*. But the cleansing from uncleanness and impurity is with much diversity of expression, given as the *work* of the Holy Spirit. Saved by the "washing of *regeneration*," "chosen through *sanctification* of the Spirit," "saved by baptism," "baptized by one spirit into one body," "*cleansed* by the *washing* of water by the word," "*washed* in pure water," "washed by the Spirit;" is the way the Holy Spirit is represented in the New Testament as accomplishing the purification from uncleanness.

3rd. Because, the history of the word baptism; its use for the Jewish purifications by *water*; *not* only expose the magnitude of thy error, but actually *warrant* the *reversal* of thy statement, making it read; the rite or ceremony of water baptism *always* put away the filth of the flesh and such a

thing was *commonly known* in Israel; as the presence of the "water pots after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, at the wedding at Cana of Galilee, distinctly shows.

4th. Because, in thy statement, that *fire was*, and *water was not* a type of Holy Ghost Baptism, thou as wholly misconceives the meaning of *fire* as a *type* as by the foregoing, I have shown thou misconceives the types of both water and blood. Of the five hundred times, which the word fire is used in the Scriptures there does not seem to be one that supports thy assertion. As a *type* or symbol of a work connected with the plan of salvation, *fire* stands in both the Old and New Testaments as a representation of *judgment*. The Old Testament examples illustrating and proving this principle, are the destruction of Sodom; the fire of Taberah; the destruction of Korah's incense burners; the destruction of the sons of Aaron. *Fire* is used in about one hundred texts directly as a symbol of judgment. The Prophets express the judgments of God, as "fury like fire," "fire of wrath," "fire of jealousy," "vengeance of fire;" and the New Testament as the "*lake of fire*" and "everlasting fire." The burning of the *sacrifice* was a symbol and type of judgment, and *not* of cleansing, for it was *always after* the rite of cleansing had been applied; Lange says the allusion by John

the Baptist to *fire* in his announcement in Matthew of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, was a reference to the judgment of God against sin. And that there is an experience of judgment represented under the symbolism of fire is proved by the application by Matthew of the words of Isaiah, to the *saving* work of Christ. "A bruised reed he will not break and *smoking* flax he will not quench till he send forth *judgment* unto victory."

In a Criticism of the *Friends' Review* on the immediate work of the Holy Spirit in the conscience of men prior to conversion, thou affirmed that it was "wholly punishing or *punitve* in its character." This *punitive* work of the Holy Spirit is the judgment, and condemnation in the conscience by which man is made sensible of God's judgment against sin, and is the spiritual *anti-type* of the fire used in the typical salvation of the law. And so far as the Scriptures teach by *type*, by *text*, or example this *punitive* work of judgment, is *all* that is represented by fire in relation to Holy Ghost Baptism.

I have now answered thy numerous statements about John's Baptism. But while I frankly admit, that water baptism *might possibly* be successfully established or defended by the teachings of Christ and his apostles after the days of John the Baptist; it is nevertheless clear,

as we believe has been fully shown, that *nothing* in the character, mission, ministry or *practice* of John the Baptist can with any Scripture authority be used to support the theory of the advocates of water baptism.

SANCTIFICATION ERROR.

But thy efforts to establish and perpetuate Water Baptism in the Society of Friends by thy assertions about John the Baptist; and especially those made about fire, water, and blood as types, are made for the *additional* purpose of establishing and defending a theory of Holy Ghost Baptism, that teaches as thou affirms, that it “does not stand connected with the new birth,” but that it is received at some subsequent time, at some advanced period of the christian’s course.” This is the grand fundamental error of thy scheme of redemption. By this error thou *loses at once* all the typical meaning of the cleansings by water under the law. Water and blood were types of different things. Each had its distinctive office. It was utterly impossible that either could be the *anti-type* of the other. It is this fundamental error that leads thee to make an unavailing effort to make blood mean *water* and *water mean fire*. And to attribute the work of the water to the blood on the *one* hand, and the work of the water to the *fire* on the other; in order to make the blood do *both* the work of

cleansing and atonement in thy theory of salvation.

WATER BEFORE BLOOD OR CLEANSING BEFORE
ATONEMENT.

In every form of uncleanness, in which *guilt* and *impurity* were joined in the typical redemption of the law, the *water* was applied for cleansing *before* the sacrifice, or blood, was offered for atonement. So manifestly apparent is this *order* of the application of the water and the blood that Lange, entitles his chapter on the Laws of Purification, in Leviticus; “*The Preliminary Conditions of Sacrifice*,” and in a Note on the cleansing of the leper Lange says “Blood and water were constantly joined together, as in this of Leprosy so in *all other* cases, page 117; and in Matthew iii, Lange quotes with approval, the view of “Meyer and others,” that, “*Every* sacrifice of the law was *preceded* by a Levitical purification with *water*.” The work of Christ was so fully pictured in the *types* of *water* and *blood*, that John describes Jesus as “he that came by water and blood.” And as if in rebuke of any who might set up a theory that purity without atonement—water without blood—was sufficient for salvation, John adds the significant words, “not by *water only* but by *water and blood*.” In thus giving each a distinct office; and in putting the *water before* the blood, John follows the order of the typical law. But when thou *perverts* and *reverses* the

Scripture order of sanctification, and sets up the claim that the "*blood alone*" brings into acceptance; the words of John "*but by water and blood,*" fully imply the opposite negative; *not* by blood *only* but *by water and blood*; not by atonement or the bare removal of sin and guilt, but by purification, or the removal of spiritual uncleanness. Cleansing and atonement must be united for our salvation. Not by water only, not by blood only, not by water substituted for blood, or by blood substituted for water, but by *water and blood*—cleansing and atonement is the divine law of redemption. For if by the *types* Christ *came* by water and blood; in the *anti-type* he will *never come in the soul* for its salvation without *both water and blood*.

The Apostle Peter addressed the Christians of the Dispersion in all parts of the world as "Elect *through sanctification of the Spirit* UNTO *sprinkling of the blood of Jesus*, (1 Peter, i, 2). The prayer of king Hezekiah for the unclean of the Congregation of Israel, in 2 Chron., xxx, 19, is without doubt the fullest Scripture definition of the meaning of the word sanctify to be found in the Old Testament. Hezekiah described those "not sanctified" as "not cleansed according to the *purification* of the sanctuary." If this was its meaning in the *type*, in the *anti-type* it can mean no less. Taking this meaning of king Hezekiah, and applying

it to the sanctification of the Spirit, we see at once that it means "*cleansed according to the purification*" of the Spirit. But the divers purifications of the sanctuary were "*baptisms.*" Therefore when the purifying work of the Holy Ghost is called *baptism* it includes, as in one comprehensive term, the washing, cleansing, purification and sanctification of the Holy Spirit; thus giving us the *fullest* and *clearest* Scripture definition of Holy Ghost Baptism anywhere to be found.

John as we have seen put the water before the blood; and Peter says, "*Through* sanctification of the Spirit, UNTO sprinkling of the blood of Jesus," putting the sanctification of the Spirit—which is the cleansing and purification of the Spirit—or Holy Ghost Baptism, *before* the sprinkling of the blood. But to preach pardon and acceptance by the blood, without this purification, is to *reverse* the teaching, and *order* of the apostles, and the Mosaic law; and teach that it is *through* sprinkling of blood unto sanctification, instead of *through* sanctification unto sprinkling of the blood as the Scriptures every where teach.

If the position herein asserted, that according to the teaching of both the Old and the New Testaments; that the purifications by *water* in the *type* and by the *Spirit* the *antitype* *always* *preceeds* the sprinkling of blood for atonement, is true; then

thy scheme of sanctification is an *awful error and delusion*.

Such a doctrine *instead* of exalting Holy Ghost Baptism, as the grand *anti-type* of the Purifications by water under the law; that goes hand in hand with the grand doctrine of the atonement by the death of Christ, the great *anti-type* of the Offerings under the law, which *they are* in the plan of salvation by Jesus Christ; *belittles* and reduces it to a sort of an *extra gift*, or *second* experience; consequently *not really necessary for salvation*.

Believing as I do that it is a dangerous *perversion* of the *divine* order in Salvation to put sanctification after some imagined acceptance by blood, when it should always go *before* pardon; and that Water Baptism is no part of the Gospel; I have felt constrained to prepare this Reply to thy Address and other writings, with a sincere desire, that it may be blessed to the help of some who are *struggling* in doubt about these things.

Commending us all to the Word of his grace—the living eternal Spirit in the soul—that is able, if we patiently abide in it, to build us up and give us an inheritance among all them who *are sanctified*: and desiring under all circumstances in life to be preserved in true christian love,

I remain thy friend,

CYRUS W. HARVEY.

Friends

134

7748

B 2

DATE DUE

FEB 05 2000

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Friends BX7748.B2 H2

Harvey, Cyrus W., 18

An open letter to David B. Upd

c.1

080107 000



3 9308 00177466 2

EARLHAM COLLEGE LIBRARIES